



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

ch

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/073,019 05/04/98 KIKINIS

D P1560

LM02/0709

DONALD R. BOYS
PO BOX 187
AROMAS CA 95004

EXAMINER

DINH, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2758

DATE MAILED:

07/09/99

S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/073,019

Applicant(s)

KIKINI'S

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Group Art Unit

2758

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/1/99
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed in** accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2758

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15 and 18-20 are ejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meske et al U.S. pat. No.5,530,852.

As to claim 1, Meske discloses the steps of :

(a) creating a listing of parameters (i.e., user profiles) derived from one or more of characteristics of the client device, characteristics of a WEB page, and preferences of a customer using the client device (see abstract, fig.1, col.2 lines 22-55, col.3 line 55-col.4 line 3).

(b) storing the parameters as a template (HTML file, 420 of fig.4) at the Web server, accessing a WEB page requested by the customer (user), translating (i.e., converting) the WEB data according to the template and transmitting the translated data to the client device (see col.5 line 58-col.6 line 36).

Art Unit: 2758

As to claim 2, Meske further teaches the parameters include details of a display used by the client device (see fig.8 and col.10 lines 41-64).

Claims 3-5 are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 2.

Claim 6 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1 and 2. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches using tools for altering the characteristics (see col.9 lines 24-48 and col.10 lines 18-40).

As to claim 7, Meske further discloses the editor executing on the client device (see col.3 line 55-col.4 line 12).

As to claim 8, Meske further discloses the editor (user) executes on a WEB server as a part of a WEB page, and is adapted for manipulation by a client accessing the WEB page (see fig.8, col.4 lines 13-51 and col.10 lines 41-64).

Claim 9 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2758

Claim 11 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 9. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches the step of accessing the WEB server by the client device and initiating execution of the Mark-Script (i.e., HTML files to SGML file).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 11.

As to claim 15, Meske further discloses a step for reducing content of pre-fetched WEB pages before transmission to the client device, by consulting parameters based on characteristics of the client device (see col.9 lines 24-48).

As to claim 18, Meske discloses a system for Internet browsing, comprising:

a host computer connected to one or more peripheral devices and to the Internet and a WEB server adapted for browsing the Internet for the host (see 150 of fig.2 and fig.5 and col.6 lines 15-51).

the WEB server fetches WEB pages for the host computer and reduces data content before transmission to the host based on characteristics of one of the peripheral devices connected to the host (see col.6 line 38-col.7 line 18 and col.9 lines 24-48).

As to claim 19, Meske further teaches the WEB server following a script furnished by the host computer for pre-fetching WEB pages and storing them at the WEB server for transmission to

Art Unit: 2758

the host computer on demand (see col.1 lines 35-57, col.6 line 38-col.7 line 18 and col.9 lines 24-48).

Claim 20 is rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 19. As to the added limitation, Meske further teaches the step of:

a source-side template adapted for converting data requested by the WEB server to an Hyper Text Markup Protocol (HTML) before transmission to the WEB server (see col.5 line 58-col.6 line 37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meske as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Judson U.S. pat. No.5,572,643.

As to claim 10, Meske's teachings still applied as in claims 1 and 9 above. Meske does not teach refreshing the current Web page. However, refreshing Web page all pre-fetched and stored WEB

Art Unit: 2758

pages according to the list of WEB pages is generally well known in the art as disclosed by Judson (see abstract, col.2 lines 29-53 and col.5 line 50-col.6 line 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Judson's teachings in Meske's network system because it would have enabled the system to update the content Web page into the current state.

Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under the same reasons set forth in claim 10.

As to claim 16, Judson further discloses a step for passing through to a client a request initiated by a pre-fetched page not yet transmitted to the client, either during or after pre-fetch (see abstract and col.3 line 46-col.4 line 24).

As to claim 17, Judson further discloses the request is for one of a security or identification input (see col.2 lines 6-28 and col.6 line 62-col.7 line 17).

Other prior art cited

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Richard Michael Rogers, U.S. Pat. No. 5,701,451: Method for fulfilling requests of a web browser.

Art Unit: 2758

- b. Takaaki Tabuki, U.S. pat. No.5,706,427: Authentication method for networks.
- c. David Hugh Judson, U.S. pat. No.5,737,619: World wide web browsing with content delivery over an idle connection and interstitial content display.
- d. Lou Montulli, U.S. pat. No.5,774,670: Persistent client state in a hypertext transfer protocol based client-server system.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-3817. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-7201.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C. Sect.133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Application/Control Number: 09/073,019

Page 8

Art Unit: 2758

K.D

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2758
June 24, 1999.

Ahmad F. Matar
AHMAD F. MATAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2700